



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the United States from England. The document is written on one side of a single sheet of paper, and is dated April 28, 1817. It can be seen in the archives of the State Department. It reads as follows:

"1. The naval forces henceforth to be maintained upon the Great Lakes shall be confined to the following vessels on each side:

"2. On Lake Ontario, one vessel not to exceed one hundred tons burden, carrying not more than twenty men and one eighteen-pound cannon.

"3. On the Upper Lakes, two vessels of same burden and armed in a like way.

"4. On Lake Champlain, one vessel of like size and armament.

"5. All other armed vessels to be at once dismantled, and no other vessel of war should be built or armed along the St. Lawrence River or on the Great Lakes."

This agreement has religiously been kept for ninety-three years. Its effect was to at once stop work on the fortifications and cause disarmament along the Great Lakes. So far as is known, the agreement will continue for all time.

Here is an example for our friends, the jingoes, to study. It is a complete refutation of their theory that a lack of armaments invites invasion and attack. On the contrary, it is a safe prediction that if these forts on the frontier had been maintained, and had the ships of war continued to sail up and down the Great Lakes, nothing short of a positive miracle would have saved us from fighting, and from a war with England. And now I ask you, what is there in the way of a similar agreement between all the nations? Only the will of the governments and rulers. [Applause.]

Selfishness, envy and fear have so far prevented them from choosing this avenue of relief and lifting from the people's shoulders a burden under which they all groan. Is America—free, majestic, isolated America—to be baffled by the same petty impulses? Mr. Chairman, it is just one hundred years ago that the world's peace movement was born, and its birthplace was the United States. I could not imagine a more glorious celebration of its centennial than by a declaration of the American Congress, through its vote on the pending bill, that this free and mighty republic, relying on its international agreements for the settlement of its differences, and believing its present armaments to be ample for defense, has once for all called a halt to further wasteful expenditure for their enlargement. [Applause.] It will mean sunshine and prosperity on this hemisphere and the dawn of a new emancipation on the other. [Prolonged applause on both sides of the Chamber.]

### The Inexcusable Growth in the Cost of Our Naval and Military Establishments.

*From the speech of Hon. James M. Slayden of Texas on the Naval Appropriation Bill in the House of Representatives April 8, 1910.*

MR. SLAYDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have read from the Clerk's desk this extract from a speech by the late Justice Brewer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"It may be said that notwithstanding such a treaty a nation may repudiate the agreement to arbitrate and attack us, but

the public opinion of the world is strong against any nation that repudiates its treaty obligations, and public opinion is today the most powerful force in the world. We have recently voted to restore to our coinage the motto 'In God we trust.' If we can trust Him as the guarantor of our dollars, may we not also trust him to make good the international agreements for peace?

"Again, when the navy bill was before Congress the nation was stirred with the scare of a possible war with Japan. I cannot help noticing how conveniently this scare appears. In the old almanacs it was often stated, 'About this time of year look out for a great storm'; and so in our political almanacs it may as well be stated that about the time of year we are considering the question of an increase in the army or navy we may look for a great hue and cry about a probable war with Japan."

MR. SLAYDEN: Mr. Chairman, that voice from the grave of a great man, whose death came as a loss to the country within the week, will serve, when Members comprehend the full significance of his speech, to bring them to an appreciation of how great that loss was. Justice Brewer always stood for sanity, for religion, for everything that tends to ennoble man and to elevate the nations of the earth. For years he stood as a bulwark, fighting only with the aid of his great intellect and high character against this wild expansion of the armament of his country, which is now, I regret to say, engaged in a hopeless and insane competition with the military nations of Europe.

He saw, as it would seem to me every man ought easily to see, that there does not obtain in this country the same reasons for large armies and great navies that do in the countries of Europe, where each nation is in immediate proximity to a potential, if not an actual, enemy. Believing, as he did, that there was a better way of preserving the peace than by shooting it into the nations of the world, he struggled for years with his mighty voice and powerful reason to advance the cause of arbitration, which has been so ardently supported on this floor by our colleague from Missouri [Mr. Bartholdt]. The expense of the armed policy of peace, the wickedness of it, appealed to him always, and never during the last ten years of his life did he fail on any occasion that presented itself to stand up for what was right as between man and man and between nation and nation and to enter his protest against this monumental folly.

Others have noted, what did not escape the observation of Justice Brewer, that coincidental with the consideration of the naval bill we unfailingly have a renewal of these alarms of war. That prophet of evil, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson], who is as amiable and peaceful in private as he is fearful in public life, always on these occasions sets our nerves on edge by openly predicting an assault from the Japanese, or darkly hinting at an attack from some European country. Sometimes one, sometimes the other, is put forward as the most imminent danger. The Japanese, being farther away, of a different race, and altogether a more mysterious factor, are usually the favorite enemy. Either is a good enough enemy for the purpose of those gentlemen who think, under their revised catechism, that the chief end of the mass of men is to pay for the support of those who hold commissions in the army and navy, make armor plate, and build ships.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that if great and selfish commercial interests were not behind this movement for an expansion beyond the requirements of a defensive navy, the program of the Secretary of the Navy, as newspapers call it, the whole expensive scheme would speedily collapse.

Support for these extravagances is secured in many ways. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] puts on his mask of fear and drives the timid into camp. He goes up and down the country telling the people of the awful things to come if they do not adopt his panacea. He parades frightful Japanese warriors before them, rattling their armor and inviting attention to their awful, frowning faces and murderous weapons, until rich people with eccentric taste are now afraid to use the images of these Oriental creatures for hall decorations. In season and out, on the Chautauqua circuits, among the mountaineers of Alabama, on the floors of Congress, and at the assemblies of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, my eloquent, amiable and interesting friend from Alabama unceasingly pleads for more and bigger Dreadnoughts. From the hustings, and wherever two or three are gathered together who will listen, he, Cassandra-like, bawls out his awful prophecies that the yellow peril is closing in about us, and in a refulgent, yellow peroration he asks for resolutions directed to Congress commanding more battleships, which the terrified ladies usually concede.

This year he is unusually modest. The Secretary of the Navy asks for two battleships, and the committee reports as instructed. Our friend from Alabama, who one time wanted twelve, now only asks for four. He explains his moderation by saying that he wants merely to maintain an equilibrium in armament, to preserve peace by equilibrium. He explains that he wants what I will venture to call a huge navy in the Pacific and another huge navy in the Atlantic. That will make two equilibriums he demands.

How fortunate it is, Mr. Chairman, that we have no territory on the Baltic, the Mediterranean, the Black Sea, and all the other seas, big and little, that are scattered throughout the world! It would bankrupt us just to maintain the equilibriums demanded by the gentleman from Alabama. Now, what is the common sense of this suggestion? It is to disarm by agreement. To reduce armaments everywhere, and in the interest of a world that is producing a scant supply of bread, to have all these consuming sailors and soldiers go to the plow and workshop. We would by that means maintain an equilibrium worth while and get more comfort for the human family at the same time. They would cease to be consumers; they would become producers. They would cease to be tax eaters; they would become taxpayers.

Gentlemen who represent shipyards, those who have armor plate or gun factories within the boundaries of their districts, and those who hope to have either, or both, rally to the banner of the Secretary and support his program. The Pacific coast does it, because of its long seaboard, because of the profit it creates for merchants and others, and, possibly, because it is really afraid of the Japanese, although I do not believe it. That is how support is brought to this bill. The allies of terror and plunder are usually strong enough to win, and I suppose that this bill will go through the House substantially as reported from the committee.

When it was reported by the committee, newspapers said that the Secretary of the Navy had had his way, and that complacent committeemen had done exactly what he commanded them to do. As a member of the legislative branch of the government, I was somewhat chagrined to see such a publication. I wish that I could feel that

this House would resent the aggression of executive officers, and make it known clearly and definitely that, while they may control the reports of a committee, they cannot direct the votes of Representatives.

The committee is not frank with the House. It puts the cost of these two battleships at \$6,000,000 each. The mere hull costs that. The ship complete, with armor plate to protect its sides against the shells of the enemy and with guns to hurl projectiles at the enemy, will cost nearly as much more. The actual cost of these great ships of war will be about \$12,000,000 more than stated, and that much should be added to the totals of this bill if Congress is to be frank with the people and let them know the real amount they will have to pay.

I do not have the technical knowledge to discuss the relative merit of this or that style of ship, and I shall not undertake it. I will content myself with saying that a naval officer, in whose professional skill I have great confidence, told me lately that, in his judgment, the submarine boats, that in comparison cost but a trifle, were, boat for boat, more than a match for the big ships of war. He said that if we only wanted a defensive navy, that if it were not our purpose to wage aggressive war at a distance, we should build more submarines and fewer Dreadnoughts.

Mr. Chairman, all these extraordinary expenses, the steady and inexcusable growth in the cost of our naval and military establishments, have their origin in the political blunders of 1898. Had we been true to the principles upon which this republic is supposed to be based, we would not now have embarrassing political associations from which dangerous situations may arise. Had we promptly come away from the Philippines, leaving the inhabitants of those islands to their own devices and to the control of their own country, we would not now be neighbors to the Japanese. Without that proximity there would be no chance for a quarrel with a people who have never invaded our continent and who have no thought of doing so. The Filipinos did not want our control in 1898; they do not want it now. They claim the right to govern themselves, and have always been ready to accept the perils and responsibilities of independence. It is exactly the sort of political aspiration that one would think Americans should sympathize with. It squares precisely with the position our fathers took in 1776 and with the Declaration of Independence.

[The rest of Mr. Slayden's speech was devoted to further discussion of the Philippine situation as it has been and now is, and to a strong plea that our government will take steps to grant the Filipinos their independence. This, he believes, would take away the strongest argument used by the big navy promoters in support of their contention. — ED.]

## Honor to Elihu Burritt.

BY JAMES L. TRYON.

When on the tenth of May the New England Peace Congress lays a laurel wreath on the grave of Elihu Burritt in New Britain, it will show respect to the memory of a man who has at last come to his own. Heretofore Mr. Burritt has been known to most people as "the learned blacksmith," a self-made man who with his marvelous mind learned many languages; but hereafter he ought also to be called "the Apostle of Peace."